

SEP 17 2010

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : Kawabuchi
Title : ROTATION AND EXTENSION/RETRACTION LINK
MECHANISM
Application No. : 10/596,628
Filing Date : April 10, 2007
Examiner : Alan B. Waits
Art Unit : 3656
Confirmation No. : 8553
Docket No. : 30761-2

Agenda for Examiner's Interview

Dear Examiner Waits:

The below is Applicant's suggested agenda for the Examiner's Interview that we requested. In reference to the outstanding office action Applicant suggests as follows (the numbering below corresponds to the numbering in the outstanding office action):

1. Objections to claims 1 and 4: Applicant will amend to replace "when" with "as."
3. Rejections of claims 3, 4, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The application shows two different combinations of shapes and sizes capable of making the invention work as disclosed. The invention disclosure and the two examples are sufficient for PHOSITA to carry out the invention and to anticipate other combinations. As the examiner correctly indicates, there may be a large number of combinations capable of making the invention work as disclosed. It is not possible or required for the application to list all combinations.

Application No. 10/596,628

Docket No. 30761-2

Page 2 of 3

5. Rejections of claims 3-6, 11-15, and 17:

- Claim 3: amend to delete “and the shapes and sizes of said first sector gear and a positional relationship therebetween.”
- Claims 3, 4, and 14: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “becomes” in claims 3, 4, and 14 is unclear. Applicant will amend to make claims clear.
- Claim 3: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “viewed in projection” in claim 3 is unclear. Applicant will amend claim 3 to make the claim clear.
- Claims 3 and 14: The Examiner indicates that the term “relatively opposite” in claims 3 and 14 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. Applicant will amend the claims to delete the term “relatively.”
- Claim 4: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “a minimum distance between said center of rotation and the second virtual center line” in claim 4 is unclear and confusing. Applicant believes that the Examiner has perhaps misunderstood what is meant by the phrase “a minimum distance between said center of rotation and the second virtual center line.” With reference to FIG. 4, the point designated by reference number 33 is the center of rotation, the line designated by reference number 103 is the first virtual center line, and the line designated by reference number 107 is the second virtual center line. The distance designated L1 is the minimum distance between the center of rotation 33 and the first virtual center line 103. The distance designated L2 is the minimum distance between the center of rotation 33 and the second virtual center line 107.
- Claims 5 and 15: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “a driving force applying mechanism which generates at least one driving force among ...” in claims 5 and 15 is unclear. Applicant will amend claims 5 and 15 to make them clear.
- Claim 6: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “said rope tension output generating mechanism” in claim 6 is unclear. Applicant will amend claim 6 to make it clear.
- Claim 11: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “sliding recess portions to be slidably fit into said sliding projections” in claim 11 is unclear. Applicant will amend claim 11 to make it clear.
- Claim 12: The Examiner indicates that the limitation “can be mechanically adjusted” in claim 12 is unclear. Applicant will amend claim 12 to make it clear.

Application No. 10/596,628

Docket No. 30761-2

Page 3 of 3

- Claim 13: Applicant will overcome the Examiner's rejection of claim 13 by converting claim 13 into an independent claim incorporating the limitations of claim 1 to make it clear.
- Claim 14: The Examiner indicates that the limitation "a second rack gear" in claim 14 is unclear. Applicant will amend claim 14 to make it clear.
- Claim 17: The Examiner indicates that the limitation "said driving rope added for" in claim 17 is unclear. Applicant will amend claim 17 to make it clear.

6. Double Patenting: The Examiner indicates that two claims, claims 9 and 10, are duplicates or else so close in content that they both cover the same thing despite a slight difference in wording.

Claims 9 and 10 are not duplicate or so close in content that they both cover the same thing. The arrangement order of the first opposing wall portion, the first opposed portion, the second opposing wall portion, and the second opposed wall portion is different. Claims 9 and 10 define different variations of the rotation and extension/retraction link mechanism according to the present invention.

Further, Applicant will amend claims 9 and 10 by deleting the phrase "to alternate with each other."